



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,792	02/18/2004	Chun-Yi Lai	252313-1010	2725
24504	7590	11/15/2006	EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW STE 1750 ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948			RIAD, AMINE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2113	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/780,792	Applicant(s) LAI ET AL.	
	Examiner Amine Riad	Art Unit 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 15-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7-14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Claims 1-20 have been submitted for examination.

Claims 1-6,15-20 have been rejected.

Claims 7-14 have been objected to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Olarig U.S Patent 6,038,680.

In regard to claim 1,

Oralig discloses a computer system, unaffected by memory module instability, comprising:

- Memory mirror unit controlling (Figure 1;Item 29) a plurality of memory modules (Figure 1; items 55a and 55b) and receiving an error control signal (Figure 1; item 27a), wherein each of the memory mirror units writes data to the corresponding memory modules during a write cycle (Column 7; lines 10-12)
- Activates a first memory module among the memory modules, reading data during a read cycle; (Column 6; lines 30-32)[Olarig discloses that the module is deactivated. [Examiner points out that in order for a memory module to be deactivated it has to be activated first during a read cycle]
- Memory controller enabling the error control signal upon detection of a read error in the first memory module (Column 7; lines 6-7), wherein the memory mirror unit

Art Unit: 2113

disables the first memory module and activates a second memory module among the memory modules when the read error occurs in the first memory module.(Column 7; lines 8-13)

In regard to claim 2

Oralig discloses the computer system as claimed in claim 1, further comprising:

- A central processing unit (CPU); (Figure 2; item 10)
- A system interruption device providing an interruption signal to the CPU to interrupt system operations and then activate the corresponding error control signal when the memory controller detects the read error. (Figure 1; item 19 NMI non maskable interrupt)

In regard to claim 3,

Oralig discloses the computer system as claimed in claim 2, wherein each memory mirror unit receives a corresponding error control signal for control of corresponding memory modules.(Column 6; lines 33-35) ["By rerouting signals from the controller to the auxiliary connector a problem can be eliminated" this means that an error signal was initially routed from the auxiliary module to the control unit for error declaration]

In regard to claims 4, 16, and 19

Oralig discloses the computer system as claimed in claim 3, wherein the memory controller determines that the read error has occurred when the memory controller

Art Unit: 2113

detects an irreparable error in the first memory module of corresponding memory modules during the read cycle. (Column 4; lines 38-47) [Item 27a where the ECC takes place is connected with item 29 through line 33, and that shows the how the controller is connected to the corresponding memory module]

In regard to claims 5, 17, and 20

Oralig discloses the computer system as claimed in claim 3, wherein the memory controller determines that the read error has occurred when the memory controller detects that the number of errors in the first memory module reaches a predetermined value. (Column 6; lines 64-67) & (Column 7; lines 1-3)

In regard to claims 15, and 18

Oralig discloses a method for controlling memory of a computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

- Providing at least one memory mirror unit,(Figure 1; item 29) each controlling a memory module group having a plurality of memory modules; (Figure 1; items 55b and 55a)
- Equalizing addresses of the memory modules inside each memory module group; (Column 2; lines 48-55)
- Writing data to the corresponding memory modules according to a write address during a write cycle; Reading a first memory module according to a read address during a read cycle; (Column 7; lines 10-13)

Art Unit: 2113

- The computer system activates an error control signal (Column 7; lines 6) received by the corresponding memory mirror unit to select a second memory module from corresponding memory modules when a read error occurs in the first memory module. (Column 7; line 8 [hot swap is considered the switch to the mirrored memory module])

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Oralig U.S Patent 6,038,680 over Ohran Patent Application Publication 2002/0099916.

Oralig discloses the computer system of parent claims 3 and 1 where the controller activates the error control signal and the memory mirror unit only activates the second memory module upon detection of the read error in the first memory module during the read cycle. (Column 7; 6-12)

Oralig does not disclose that the memory mirror unit activates the first and second memory module during the write cycle, and only activates the first memory module during the read cycle.

Ohran teaches that:

- The memory mirror unit activates the first and second memory module during the write cycle ,(Page 1; Paragraph 13;"for each write request, a copy of the request is written into the backup system") [Requests here are equivalent to activating]
- Only activates the first memory module during the read cycle. (Page 3; Paragraph 31; "A read operation is performed by the primary computer") [Requests here are equivalent to activating]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to implement the activation of the first and second memory module during a write cycle, and activating the first memory module during the read cycle of Ohara into the computer system of Oralig.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification because mirroring allows recovery from failures as disclosed by Ohara (Page 1; Paragraph 7)

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Applicant's Argument

Applicant arguments filed on September 24, 2006 have been fully considered, and are not persuasive.

In regard to the argument in which the Applicant states:

"Oralig does not disclose all limitations in the claims 1, 15, and 18.... Each of the independent claims 1, 15, and 18 patently define over the cited art for the reason that the cited art fails to disclose the [writing]. Simply stated, Oralig fails to teach or suggest the [writing] feature that is defined in each of the independent claims. Taking one memory unit as an example, if the memory mirror unit of the invention controls a plurality of memory modules, when the error signal is deactivated, the memory mirror unit of the invention writes data to all memory modules during the write cycle. Clearly, Oralig writes information into one module 55a during a write cycle. When threshold information in the register 68 indicates that a predetermined number of errors have occurred, Oralig reads the information from the problem module and to write the information from the problem module and to write the information into an auxiliary module 55b and writes information into the auxiliary module 55b. Thus, Oralig does not write information into the auxiliary module 55b during the write cycle"

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner points Applicant to (Column 6; lines 22-32) where Oralig discloses "*When the ECC logic 79 indicates that the threshold level of errors has been exceeded or when the system has crashed, for example, due to an uncorrectable memory error, the problem module 55a is thereby identified and its location is stored in the logic 76. All control signals and address signals normally associated with the problem module 55a are then redirected to a module 55b in the auxiliary connector 57. In this way, a good module 55b in the auxiliary connector 57 may be substituted for the problem 55a and the problem module deactivated for subsequent replacement. By rerouting signals from the*

Art Unit: 2113

controller 29 to the auxiliary connector 57, a problem module 55a in the connector 53 can be eliminated and replaced. The defective module 55a is located by interrogating the address log contained in the memory interface 72, for example to, to determine the address that was being addressed when the failure occurred"

Examiner will explain that Applicant's argument does not stand on solid ground. When all the control signals are routed to module 55b, and module 55a is deactivated, this action means that module 55b is ready to carry the request addressed to module 55a from the point where the failure happened. In order to accomplish that, module 55b must have all the information that was requested before the failure, in other words all the requests sent to module 55a must be sent to module 55b, and the only way to do that is by sending write requests to both module 55a and 55b. From the above demonstration, it is clear that Oralig does not only write to module 55a, but also writes to module 55b in contrary to Applicant's argument.

In addition, Examiner makes the observation that claim language recites "wherein each of the memory mirror units writes data to corresponding memory modules during a write cycle" not the memory mirror unit of the invention writes data to all memory modules during the write cycle as argued by the Applicant.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2113

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amine Riad whose telephone number is 571-272-8185.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on 571-272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR
Amine Riad
Patent Examiner
11/3/2006

Art Unit: 2113

Robert H. Beausoleil
ROBERT H. BEAUSOLEIL
PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL CENTER 2100